

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I do hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on April 10, 2003 as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Attn: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Beth Pearson-Naul
Beth Pearson-Naul

Gp 2831
#1/Response
D. EVANS
4-22-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:
Arjun Selvakumar et al.

Serial No.: 09/914,421

Filed: January 22, 2002

Title: "Low Stress Die Attachment"

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 2831

Examiner: Hung V. Ngo

Attorney Docket: IO-1015US

Confirmation No.: 5380

RECEIVED
APR 21 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION, DATED MARCH 26, 2003

This is in response to the Office Action, dated March 26, 2003 for the above-identified patent application.

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 41 are pending in the application. Claims 1-41 stand rejected. Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments traversing the rejections.

35 USC § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Takahashi* (US 5,540,593). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not presented a prima facie case for anticipation.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner addresses the limitations of a package, a mass and a resilient coupling. Independent claim 1, however, includes the additional limitation:

the mass further including an active region; and
one or more substantially rigid members for attaching at least one point on the

surface to the package to create a resilient coupling between the mass and the package, wherein at least a portion of the active region is spaced apart from the at least one point of attachment."

Independent method claim 25 includes the limitations:

"attaching at least one surface point on the mass to the package using one or more substantially rigid members to create a resilient coupling between the mass and the package, wherein at least a portion of the active region is spaced apart from the at least one point of attachment.

Takahashi teaches a device for reducing mechanical stress on, for example, an integrated circuit (IC) by mounting the IC in a package using springs. Therefore, *Takahashi* does not teach the claimed limitation regarding a rigid member used to create a resilient coupling. Moreover, the *Takahashi* reference does not teach the claimed mass having an active and passive region.

For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must include each and every element of the claim. The *Takahashi* reference does not teach or suggest the limitations regarding a rigid member used to create a resilient coupling or a mass having an active region and a passive region. These limitations are neither taught nor suggested by any other reference on record or known by the Applicant. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Takahashi* or any other prior art reference on record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and independent claim 25 are allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2-24 depend from claim 1, and claims 26-41 depend from claim 25. These dependent claims necessarily include each and every limitation of the corresponding independent claim. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-24 and 26-41 are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as stated for the corresponding independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. No fee is believed due for filing this response. The Commissioner

is hereby authorized to charge any fee due for this response to Deposit Account No. 13-0010 (IO-1015US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2003



Todd A. Bynum, Reg. No. 39,488
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.
2603 Augusta, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77057-5638
Tel: (713) 266-1130
Fax: (713) 266-8510
Attorney For Applicants